PECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 1 4 2008

## HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP San Jose, California

## **MEMORANDUM**

DATE:

April 14, 2008

TQ:

Examiner Ann Loftus; Tel. 571.272.7342; Fax. 571.273.8300

FROM:

Karl Rees; Tel. 408-414-1233; Fax 408-414-1076

SUBJECT:

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/078,051 (Abdi, et al.)

Attorney Docket No. 50269-0516 3<sup>rd</sup> Office Action (Non-Final)

## Agenda for Telephone Interview on April 15th, 2008, at 2 P.M. (EST)

- I. Discuss disqualification of Hosea prior art
- II. Overview of Claim 1
- III. Discuss differences between cited references and Claim 1
  - a. Liu does not disclose intercepting a message "wherein the message is addressed to said second participant and not to said device."
  - b. The references do not disclose "determining whether said message has billing implications."
  - c. The references do not disclose that maintaining a log occurs "if said message has billing implications."
- IV. Discuss differences between cited references and Claim 2
  - a. Extracting a URL is not "identifying which services are being provided to said clients by said servers based on the content of messages."
- V. Discuss differences between cited references and Claim 13
  - a. Oliver does not teach to determine a service class based on an identity determined from identifier information in an intercepted message.
  - b. Oliver does not teach that the intercepting device should "direct said message . . . based on said service class."